

HAWAIIAN GAZETTE

Entered at the Postoffice of Honolulu, H. T., Second-class Matter,
Semi-Weekly—Issued Tuesdays and Fridays.

WALTER G. SMITH, Editor.

Subscription Rates:

Per Month.....\$ 2.50 Per Month, Foreign.....\$ 3.50
Per Year.....\$30.00 Per Year, Foreign.....\$45.00

Payable Invariably in Advance.

CHARLES S. CRANE, Manager.

TUESDAY : : : : : OCTOBER 27

THE ATTEMPTED BLACKMAILING CASE.

When the charge was first published that Mr. Cathcart had attempted to blackmail the Kapiolani Estate, the Cathcart supporters gleefully asserted, in Mr. Kinney's absence, that the latter had "turned it down" and did not believe it. Now Mr. Kinney has returned, and corroborates Mr. Colburn in every particular in which the latter claimed that he was connected. He asserts that Colburn did come to him "hot-foot from the first interview with Cathcart," then and there telling the story, as he tells it now, and seeking advice from his attorney as to what to do. It so impressed Kinney that he went and consulted Mr. Thurston about it.

What earthly object could Mr. Colburn have had in concocting such a story? If it had been a plot for the purpose of injuring Mr. Cathcart, would he have kept it quiet all this time? If this had been his object, would he not have made some use of it, instead of keeping still until it was brought to light through another source entirely?

What motive did he have in trying to injure Mr. Cathcart, that he would be guilty of such a dastardly lie, only to drop it as soon as it was connected? In Mr. Cathcart's Orpheum answer, he denounced Mr. Colburn as a falsifier; complained at the lack of dates and places specified in the charge, and then refused to allow Mr. Colburn to give dates and places, the latter being present and offering to do so.

Mr. Cathcart's answer, and his only answer to the charge, is a flat denial. In his own words, his "only defence is an alibi."

Voters of Oahu, do you believe that John Colburn fabricated this story out of whole cloth, and consulted his attorney about it just for fun?

Taken in connection with the fact that about the same time Cathcart made a proposition to Chillingworth and Brown of so shady a nature that they felt in duty bound to report to the Governor that it rendered him unfit to be appointed Attorney-General, and that the Governor adopted the same view, is there not raised a "reasonable presumption" at least that he did make some kind of a proposition to Colburn? If he made any kind of a proposition to Colburn, he stands convicted; for, in his Orpheum speech, he denied talking to Colburn on the subject at all.

With the "reasonable presumption" raised, that he did make some kind of a proposition to Colburn, is it a safe thing to elect him to an office, the occupant of which should be above suspicion?

MR. CATHCART'S DEFENSE.

Mr. Cathcart has had his day in court at the Orpheum, and, unchecked by interruption or cross-examination, has stated to his heart's content and in his own language, his defense to the charges preferred against him by the Advertiser as a candidate for public office.

A complete verbatim stenographer's report of Mr. Cathcart's speech appears in another part of this issue although, to do this, we have been forced to exclude other very material matter. Every precaution has been taken to give Mr. Cathcart fair play, his defense reaching everyone that has read the accusations. Beside this he has had the advantage of a personal explanation of his position to a large body of voters.

The sentimental plea, therefore, that it is a case of the under dog attacked by an unscrupulous newspaper, which plea has undoubtedly influenced a number in favor of Mr. Cathcart, should certainly be relegated to the waste basket and the controversy from now on judged upon its merits, we prefacing this statement with the promise that Mr. Cathcart shall have, at all times, all the space he wants in this paper for a complete elucidation of his defense.

The Advertiser does not accept his explanation as a satisfactory one, nor as one which should restore him to the confidence of the voter. We propose to analyze his defense from time to time and to go more fully into the pros and cons of Mr. Cathcart's candidacy for public office. We confess we should like to begin that analysis of his defense today, but we can not do that and print his speech in full; space forbids. In passing, however, and, as having a bearing upon the gist of Mr. Cathcart's defense in the Goo Wan Hoy matter that he was not the attorney for Goo Wan Hoy but for Palea, we publish in this issue certain letters and receipts as well as a deed from Palea to Goo Wan Hoy which speak for themselves. Comment thereon will be reserved for another issue.

Meanwhile the reader should bear in mind that we have no concern in John W. Cathcart as a man but we, in common with all citizens, have every concern in John W. Cathcart as a candidate for an office which will have wide control over public prosecutions for crime and it is solely from that standpoint that the Advertiser has taken its present stand against Mr. Cathcart and will continue to maintain its conviction that the interests of the people will not be served in electing him to office.

As to the result. The Advertiser has had too long an experience with the vote of this community, not to have faith in the honest good sense of the majority. The facts about Cathcart may not appeal to gentlemen who are averse to carry the whole ticket to victory; they may not appeal to heblers who live by politics; they may not convince the thoughtless and irresponsible; but the men who carried the day in the battle for reform two years ago against greater odds and a far less vulnerable candidate than Cathcart are still on the firing line.

MR. CATHCART PLEADS GUILTY.

Mr. Cathcart was given nine columns of space in this paper on Saturday last in which to answer the charges made against him by the Advertiser.

One of the charges made was that he had proposed to a Director of the Rapid Transit Company, and a business associate of one of the largest stockholders of the Gas Company, that he, Cathcart, would be a "friend at court" to the Gas Company and the Rapid Transit Company, and in return receive the political support of the Advertiser.

This charge is not denied. It is not even mentioned in Mr. Cathcart's nine-column answer.

By his failure to deny this charge, Mr. Cathcart pleads guilty to it. For that matter he had already admitted it to the Judd special committee.

Both of the above-named corporations are subject to the supervision and control in important respects of the Board of Supervisors. The Board, in turn, is dependent upon the County Attorney for advice as to its legal rights and powers, and for their enforcement in the courts, against such corporations, if such course becomes necessary.

If there is any one thing that American experience has taught, it is a warning against permitting public service corporations from securing control over the officers of the government who are charged with their supervision. Endless corruption and injury to the public interests have come through such unholy alliances.

The County Attorney should be a man of such character that he would scorn even the suggestion that he could be influenced, in his official conduct, toward public franchise holders, by their giving him political support or otherwise. Much more is it a significant thing that he himself should have sought and proposed it.

There is no insinuation in the foregoing statement that the corporations in question would misuse the power which they would have had over Mr. Cathcart if they had followed his suggestion and made a bargain with him; but the fact that the present owners of these corporations are honest men does not lessen the viciousness of the proposition from the County Attorney's standpoint. It throws a sidelight on his character and actions that illustrate what he is capable of if he has the chance. It demonstrates that it is not safe to have him hold the office of County Attorney.

Mr. Cathcart says, in the afternoon papers, that Adachi is a scoundrel, or something of the kind. The Advertiser quite agrees in this opinion concerning Mr. Adachi; but Mr. Cathcart should remember the Arabic proverb that "he who lies down with dogs, gets up with fleas." People are judged by their associates, and if Mr. Cathcart permits gentlemen of Adachi's peculiar brand of morals to have the run of his office, he must expect that the public will wink the other eye when he waxes indignant at stories of what Adachi is doing there.

BREAKING TRADITIONS OF JAPAN.

The Japanese of Honolulu, and doubtless in the same measure those of Japan, are tremendously impressed with the fact that the Empress of Japan went to the extent of shaking hands with the American officers, Admiral Sperry and his captains, during the royal reception last week in Tokio. This impression is voiced in the Hawaii Shippo, which in its English edition yesterday, gave prominence to the fact that the traditions of the centuries concerning Japanese royalty have been broken.

"While the ordinary Westerner may look upon the affair as an ordinary thing and not know that there is much significance in this singular act of our beloved and almost apotheosized Empress toward the American naval men, there can be no question of its significance to Japanese minds," says the Shippo. "It is indeed a historic affair that breaks the tradition of a thousand years."

"Ever since there was history, our sovereigns, who were invariably deified and were always the center of the nation's worship, were the recipients of bows, but never the offerers. To approach them was a trespass for common people; to see them in person was the greatest honor of a lifetime. Fifty years ago our nation was put in tumult over the discussion of how to save our country from the trespass of foreigners, which was thought would bring disgrace upon the sacred name of our rulers who reigned over the land for thousands of years. The Empire of Nippon was considered a holy land because our deified sovereigns ruled over it."

"Foreign intrusion was therefore strongly resented until the whole country was brought to the boiling point, and the white snow that covered the pathway to the Gate of Sakurada was stained with the crimson blood of Premier Ii Kameo, who signed his name to the memorable agreement that opened Japan to foreign intercourse. It is a dream now. Yet even this day who among us ever dreamed that our most exalted Empress would shake hands with the foreigners? Japanese, no matter how high in social position they may be, will never dare to touch her person."

"We can not hear this news without a great awe and a heartfelt gratitude to our sovereign, because we think that such an act on the part of the Empress was performed with her sincerest wish to cement the tie between the two nations represented by herself and her foreign visitors. No word will express this sense of our gratitude."

"Our proverb says: 'Bare thy crimson heart and appeal to the other's conscience.' For months and years Japan was misrepresented to America by those who meant to play mischief, and thereby accomplish their selfish purposes. Even the present visit of the White Fleet to Japan's shores was misrepresented to mean a threat; and some uneasiness prevailed among the people about the outcome of the fleet's visit to Japan—where an unprecedented welcome is now being extended to the fleet, and which, combined with the message from President Roosevelt, is interpreted by the Japanese papers as a silent alliance between the two nations."

"When two friends have misunderstood each other, a heart-to-heart talk will make the matter right. Why should it not be the same with nations? Our country, represented by our highest and most beloved Empress, 'bares our crimson heart and appeals to America's conscience' in order to adjust the few misunderstandings which have cropped up, and which might have, if unwisely and maliciously agitated, developed into a great disaster for the world."

"Japan is now doing her utmost in welcoming the American visitors and through them expresses to the American public her true attitude, relying on the clear conscience of the American nation for the solution of the problems arising between the two."

KAEA AND CATHCART.

The Republican Central Committee, when it threw George Kaea off the ticket, said that it did so because he was "of bad character and notorious reputation"; that the Republican party is one of high ideals, affording no room for law-breakers, and it is inconsistent with the dignity of the Republican party and the welfare of the Territory of Hawaii that a man of the character which Kaea is shown to possess should be a candidate for Representative." They said further that "it would be a disgrace to the Hawaiian people and to the Territory of Hawaii to have it given out to the world that a man of his character should be selected as a representative of the Hawaiian people."

What had George Kaea done that he deserved this severe language? He had played craps; he had run a crap game; he had been convicted of being drunk; of assault and battery and of vagrancy—which means that he was not working for a living. He was a poor kanaka, who lived by his wits; but what is there, in the list of his offenses, that compares in enormity and in the absolute demoralization of respect for law with the self-confessed actions of the County Attorney?

John W. Cathcart is an educated man; a lawyer of high ability; one who has had all the advantages which the highest civilization of the United States affords.

Why should the crap-shooter be kicked out with ignominy and forceful adjectives, while the self-confessed "indictment-fixer" is clung to as though he were the hope of the party?

If it would have been the stigma on the fair name of Hawaii and the Hawaiians to elect a crap-shooter to the Legislature, what effect will it have upon that reputation, at home and on the mainland, when it becomes known that an admitted charge of falsifying indictments is no bar to election in Honolulu to the highest legal office within the gift of the people? Will it not be made use of by the enemies of the Republican party as proof that the party is rotten at the core and can not be trusted? Will it not give a fair basis for the charge that, not the Hawaiians, but the haoles of Hawaii, are perverted in their moral sensibilities, and can not be trusted?

Taken in connection with the self-confessed charge that Mr. Cathcart tried to traffic with the powers of his office, by seeking to be "a friend at court" to public service corporations, in exchange for political support, will the question not be fairly asked: "If these facts are not sufficient to disqualify a man for high public office in Hawaii, how far down the scale of moral obliquity must he get before he will be disqualified?"

Republicans of Oahu, what do you think the judgment of Theodore Roosevelt would be in such a matter as this?

WHEN CATHCART RAN BEFORE.

In the election of two years ago J. W. Cathcart, though without newspaper opposition, made a very poor run. His total vote, as published two days after election, was 2128. But Kalauekalani, Jr., had 3377 votes, getting considerable benefit outside the party. Mr. Bieknell polled 2820 votes, W. O. Smith 2616, and Charles Chillingworth 2645. Taking the three last-named candidates as getting the ordinary party vote, and the average Republican vote was 2693. Cathcart, without a newspaper voice raised against him—this journal merely ignoring his candidacy—ran 505 behind his ticket, and this despite the extraordinary efforts of the Brown machine to aid him.

If possible, more conclusive as to his party unpopularity is a comparison of the vote received with that received by the party nominees for the House of Representatives.

In the Fourth District, Cathcart received 1209 votes. The six Republican nominees for the House received: A. D. Castro, 1535; J. A. Hughes, 1895; J. H. S. Kaleo, 1428; E. A. C. Long, 1661; E. W. Quinn, 1787; W. T. Rawlins, 1823.

In the Fifth District, Cathcart received 979 votes. The six Republican nominees for the House received: S. P. Correa, 1253; Joe Kalana, 1242; A. S. Kalelopi, 1308; H. N. Kanihonui, 1017; H. K. Lelelwi, 1136; J. L. Paoo, 1028.

The average Republican vote in the Fourth District was 1688. Cathcart got 1209, running 479 behind his ticket.

The average Republican vote in the Fifth District was 1164. Cathcart received 979, running 185 behind his ticket. Averaging the two districts, he ran 332 behind his ticket.

Cathcart got the lowest vote of any Republican who was elected. He ran more than 500 votes behind A. M. Brown, who was defeated.

PEARL HARBOR.

The New York Sun, than which, in times past, no Eastern paper has given more intelligent attention to Hawaii, says that Pearl Harbor is "little more than a salt marsh just around the corner from Honolulu." It would be quite as exact to say that New York bay is a tidewater swamp a few blocks from Williamsburg. As to salt marshes, the one great harbor is no more prolific in them than the other; indeed, but a few years ago New York bay on the lower Jersey side had miles of swampy margin—miles where Pearl Harbor has rods. There is, in Pearl Harbor, room and depth for all the navies—"the greatest natural refuge in the world," Admiral Mahan calls it, "for naval vessels." It is reached by a narrow channel about a mile long, the greater part of which is deep enough to float battleships. As for the "salt marsh," the depths of its wide inner channel from the mainland entrance for about four miles have a maximum of twenty-three fathoms and a minimum of four.

Judging from the record of protested notes, Cathcart's bond seems to be as good as his word.

CIVIC FEDERATION ON CATHCART.

The charges now standing against this candidate before this community are of such a nature, are supported by such evidence, and are so strengthened by the utterly inadequate reply made by Mr. Cathcart himself, that the Federation does not see how any patriotic elector can vote for him, and believes that good citizens should oppose his election. It is also of the opinion that his conduct of his office during the past two years wholly disqualifies him from election.

For the Executive Committee.

Z. K. MYERS, Acting President,
Committee on Legislation and Public Servants,
C. H. DICKEY, Chairman,
D. SCUDDER,
W. R. CASTLE.

THAT 160 ACRES OF LAND.

The evidence multiplies that the Honorable L. L. McCandless did make promises to the backwoods voters on Hawaii and Maui that, if elected, he would get a law passed which would permit the natives to each obtain 160 acres for \$10 or thereabouts. In Honolulu he is now denying that he made the statement.

We suggest to the Republican campaign leaders that his denial be wired up to the districts where the promises were made and be given general circulation there, so that the voters who accepted his word as gospel can see what the revised version of the gospel, according to Link, sounds like. Demagogic talk generally trips the talker up in the long run, but not always as quickly as this boomerang has done.

Try again Link. Suppose you offer the voters 160 acres apiece down at your Dukedom at Makua, or over at the Principality of Waikane. That will sound more like business. Meanwhile, whatever the differences are, over other nominations, all citizens who want to see the recent magnificent work for Hawaii in Congress continued, should work, as well as vote, for the election of Kuhio.

It was, of course, to be expected that Mr. Kinney would confirm so much of the Colburn story as was attributed to him. The fact remains, however, that he knows nothing but what Colburn told him, and that as manager of the last campaign he turned the charge down, by not using it to defeat Cathcart and elect the Democratic candidate, which it was his duty to do if he believed in the charge and thought it could be substantiated.—Star.

Mr. Kinney, as we have said before, did not turn the charge down. As counsel for the Kapiolani Estate, he had no right to use it in politics without the assent of the directors, who thought the least said about an inheritance tax of \$35,000 the better. The recent publication, made in Mr. Kinney's absence, received the assent of the treasurer of the Estate in the letter he published over his name. Mr. Kinney's silence two years ago was professional.

Two years ago A. M. Brown had a compact and powerful organization, including the police and road department. Every public man who has since come out for Cathcart was for him, and many that haven't. The charges against Mr. Brown were "mere persiflage" besides those against the County Attorney, and the Republican organization fought for him without reserve. Yet Brown was defeated. Now, with the party at odds with itself; with the machine weakened; with charges of the gravest import against Cathcart, multiplying, as they are, day by day; with the Hawaiian voters enraged by the difference between the treatment of Kaea and the treatment of Cathcart, and with the split-ticket idea gaining ground, what possible chance has the nominee for being elected?

Query: Were the spies and detectives detailed by the police department to shadow Cathcart and spy upon his home, paid with public money? Let us hear if public money was spent by Iaukea in trying to help the Advertiser to do up his fellow official?—Star.

The only detecting that we know of being done about Cathcart's house occurred a year or so ago, when Chinese bribe-givers, who had failed to get next to the Chief of Detectives at his home, were caught coming out of Cathcart's. As to public money being used in the Cathcart case now, the only sums we have track of are those paid to the burlesque detective, Lake, who is being paid by the county as a runner for Cathcart personally.

Mr. Cathcart is as reckless in his charges as he is lame in his defence. His statement that this paper has bought or attempted to buy evidence against him in Chinatown or Iwilei, where so many of his clients and runners come from, is clearly mendacious. Evidence from there has been peddled, but so far as we know, no customers for it have been found.

As to the truth of the Star's charges that the police are spying on Cathcart, this paper knows nothing, though after reading his Honolulu record they could scarcely be blamed if they did.

OCEANIC BOATS FOR COLONIES RUN AGAIN.

Call.—Following close upon the interchange of expressions of good will between the United States and New Zealand, incident to the visit of the fleet in the south seas, comes the announcement that the two countries are to be connected once more by a direct line of steamships. The service will be resumed in January of next year by the Oceanic Steamship Company in conjunction with the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand. After an absence of one year, during which New Zealand and the United States have been practically out of touch with each other, vessels carrying the American flag will again ply regularly between San Francisco and New Zealand.

With the new year a regular passenger and mail service will be inaugurated between San Francisco and Wellington, the capital of New Zealand. Not only will the new line aid in building up America's commerce and its merchant marine, but it will tend to add to the importance of the port of San Francisco. When the Oceanic service was discontinued a year ago, predictions were made that the New Zealand trade that had passed through this port would find its way to the upper harbors of the Pacific or to Canada. The recent visit of the fleet to New Zealand has greatly strengthened America's position in the south seas, and an increased traffic is looked for as a result.

The route has been arranged for the special advantage of travelers, and will allow a two-days' stopover at Tahiti. The reversal of the seasons will admit of a perpetual summer trip, Tahiti enjoying its warm season during the California winter.

The sailing arrangements formerly in effect made Auckland the port of call in New Zealand, but the new schedule planned to begin next January makes Wellington the point of destination.

W. H. McClellan, regular nominee of the Democratic party for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of Honolulu, has been connected with the sales department of the Honolulu Iron Works for the past ten years. He bears a fine reputation with his employers and asks the electors to vote for him next Tuesday.

WONG MOON TONG FIRST REGISTRATION CULPRIT.

C. H. McBride, the Governor's secretary, who was recently commissioned by the Secretary of the Territory to go after fraudulent registrations by Chinamen, fired the first shot of his campaign last night with the arrest of Wong Moon Tong.

Wong Moon Tong was anxious to go to the Coast but had no Hawaiian birth certificate. He asked Mr. McBride if he could get a permit but was refused on account of having no permit to enter the United States. After being refused this permit on October 3 he swore to Hawaiian birth with Lee Sing and Au Mong as witnesses who said that they had attended his birth party in the Ahi block.

Secretary Mott-Smith swore out a warrant for his arrest yesterday, but the Chinaman could not be found until a late hour, when he was finally unearthed by Officer Ahi and Mr. McBride at 815 Young street, where he used to work. More arrests will follow, as the authorities have determined to wage a vigorous campaign against fraudulent registration.

Dredger Men on Hand.

Dredger men are arriving in town to look over the Pearl Harbor proposition. Among them is Captain Mascuine, who represents a company with a new hydraulic dredge controlled by the Bowers people. T. H. Green is here representing the North American Dredging company. Bids to be opened in December for the Pearl Harbor channel and harbor dredging call for the removal of 5,000,000 yards of material. The bids are to be opened in Washington and it will take about two weeks before the bids actually reach here by the mail route.

J. H. Brown, Federal inspector, is now at Hilo looking over the preparations for the work on the breakwater. He is building a residence contiguous to the work.